

REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for reviewing the present application.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1 to 20 have been cancelled and new claims 21 to 39 are submitted herewith, which have been drafted to further distinguish over the references cited by the Examiner. The Applicant submits that no new subject matter has been added by the introduction of new claims 21 to 39.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 3 and 14 to 20 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,265,103 to Brightwell ("Brightwell") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,909,887 to Fauconnier *et al.* ("Fauconnier").

The Applicant has cancelled claims 1 to 3 and 14 to 20 and submits herewith new claims 21 to 39, which the Applicant has drafted to further distinguish over the teachings of Brightwell and Fauconnier. The Applicant submits that for at least the reasons explained below, new claims 21 to 39 are not disclosed or suggested by Brightwell or Fauconnier, whether the teachings of Brightwell and Fauconnier are considered alone or in combination.

Independent claim 21:

New claim 21 recites a correspondent having a frame counter value and a sequence counter value stored in its memory. The frame counter value is generated by a frame counter, and the sequence counter value is generated by a sequence counter. Therefore, these two values are distinct entities stored in memory. This subject matter alone distinguishes over Brightwell since Brightwell only discloses each correspondent (i.e. each node in Brightwell) having a frame sequence counter 27 which generates a sequence number. The value generated by sequence counter 27 may be stored in register 28 (see col. 3 lines 21-26 of Brightwell). Brightwell does not disclose each node generating both a frame counter value and a sequence counter value.

Furthermore, claim 21 recites the step of calculating a compressed representation of the frame counter value by removing from the frame counter value a component equal to the sequence counter value. Brightwell does not disclose or suggest any such teaching. Brightwell simply discloses each node having a sequence counter 27 which assigns a sequence number to each frame. Brightwell does not disclose the node calculating a compressed representation of the sequence number, let alone calculating a compressed representation of the sequence number by removing from the sequence number a component equal to another value. As stated above, Brightwell only discloses each node generating a sequence number, not a sequence counter value and a frame counter value.

Moreover, claim 21 further recites generating and transmitting a message comprising the sequence counter value and the compressed representation of the frame counter value. Brightwell does not disclose or suggest such a teaching. Notably, Brightwell does not disclose the structure of its messages, other than to state that a sequence number is assigned to each frame (col 3, line 22 of Brightwell). Brightwell therefore clearly does not show a message being generated that comprises: 1) a sequence counter value, and 2) a compressed representation of a frame counter value.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicant submits that the subject matter recited in claim 21 is not disclosed, or even suggested, by Brightwell. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that Fauconnier does not supply the teaching missing from Brightwell, and therefore even the combined teachings of Brightwell and Fauconnier do not disclose or suggest claim 21.

Independent claim 30:

New claim 30 recites a correspondent having a frame counter that generates frame counter values and a sequence counter that generates sequence counter values. Since the frame counter values are generated by a frame counter, and the sequence counter values are generated by a sequence counter, therefore, the frame counter values and the sequence counter values are distinct entities. This subject matter alone distinguishes over Brightwell since Brightwell only discloses each correspondent (i.e. each node in Brightwell) having a frame sequence counter 27 which generates a sequence number (see col. 3 lines 21-22 of Brightwell).

Brightwell does not disclose each node generating both frame counter values and sequence counter values.

Furthermore, claim 30 recites the step of transmitting to a second correspondent an initial frame counter value and an initial sequence counter value. Brightwell does not disclose such a teaching. Brightwell simply discloses each node having a sequence counter 27 which assigns a sequence number to each frame. Brightwell does not disclose or suggest both a frame counter value and a sequence counter value being transmitted to another node.

Moreover, claim 30 further recites the step of generating and transmitting messages comprising a sequence counter value, but not a frame counter value. As stated above, Brightwell does not disclose the structure of its messages, other than to state that a sequence number is assigned to each frame (col 3, line 22 of Brightwell). Brightwell therefore clearly does not teach transmitting a message having a sequence counter value, but not a frame counter value.

Moreover, claim 30 further recites the step of periodically generating and transmitting messages comprising both a frame counter value and a sequence counter value. As discussed above, Brightwell does not disclose the structure of its messages. Therefore, Brightwell clearly does not teach periodically transmitting a message having a sequence counter value and a frame counter value.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicant submits that the subject matter recited in claim 30 is not disclosed, or even suggested, by Brightwell. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that Fauconnier does not supply the teaching missing from Brightwell, and therefore even the combined teachings of Brightwell and Fauconnier do not disclose or suggest claim 30.


Dependent claims:

The Applicant submits that dependent claims 22 to 29 and 31 to 39 are not disclosed or suggested by Brightwell or Fauconnier, whether Brightwell and Fauconnier are considered alone or in combination, at least for the reason that each of these dependent claims incorporates the subject matter of either claim 21 or claim 30.

Summary

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant believes the claims submitted herewith are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests early reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



John R.S. Orange
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 29,725

Date: 9 Mar, 2009

BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP
Suite 2800, P.O. Box 25
199 Bay Street, Commerce Court West
Toronto, Ontario M5L 1A9
CANADA

Tel: 416-863-3164
JRO/JEFL/

21842490.1